



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/618,190	07/18/2000	John Richardson Bell	US000169	9697

7590 01/23/2004

Russell Gross
c/o US Philips Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
580 White Plains Road
Tarrytown, NY 10591

EXAMINER

LE, DANH C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/618,190

Applicant(s)

BELL, JOHN RICHARDSON

Examiner

DANH C LE

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2, 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rautila (US 6,524,189).

As to claim 1, Rautila teaches a mobile (figure 2) apparatus comprising:

first interface (260) means for communicating over a first communication network using a first data format;

second interface (262) means for communicating over a second communication network using a second data format; and,

processing (250) means, said processing means being coupled to the first and second interface means, and being configurable to forward first data received from the first network to the second network after conversion of the received first data from the first format to the second format (col.4, line 31-col.5, line 8).

As to claim 2, Rautila teaches the apparatus of Claim 1, wherein the processing means is configurable to forward second data received from the second network to the

Art Unit: 2683

first network after conversion of the received second date from the second format to the first format (col.4, line 59-col.5, line 67).

As to claim 4, Rautila teaches an apparatus of Claim 1, wherein the first communication network is a radio telephony network (col.2, lines 7-14).

As to claim 6, Rautila teaches the apparatus of Claim 1, wherein the second communication network is a Personal Access Network (col.2, lines 7-14).

As to claim 7, Rautila teaches the mobile apparatus of Claim 1, wherein the processing means is configured by a user (col.4, lines 32-48).

As to claim 9, Rautila teaches the mobile apparatus of Claim 1, wherein the processing means is configured by data received from either one of the first and the second communication networks (col.4, lines 32-48).

As to claim 12, the claim is a system claim of claim 1, therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth in the claim 1.

As to claim 13, the claim is a system claim of claim 4, therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth in the claim 4.

As to claim 14, the claim is a system claim of claim 6, therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth in the claim 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 3, 5, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rautila in view of Makela (US 6,301,338).

As to claims 3, 5, and 8, Rautila teaches a mobile of claim 1, Rautila fails to teach the received first data is text message data, the first data format is a Short Message Service data format and the processing means is configured by a speech command. Makela teaches the received first data is text message data (col.2, lines 54-62 and col.9, lines 15-27), the first data format is a Short Message Service data format (col.5, lines 1-23) and the processing means is configured by a speech command (col.8. lines 6-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Makela into the system of Rautila in order to enhance system performance of the mobile telephone and game unit.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10, 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As to claims 10 and 11, the teaching of above prior art fails to teach he mobile further comprising a user interface for exchanging data of a third format with a user and wherein, the processing means is configurable to forward third data received from either owe of the first network and the second network to the user- interface after conversion of the received third data to the third format.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. Karabinis et al (US 6,134,437) teaches the dual mode satellite/cellular phone architecture with physical separation mode.

B. Kobayashi teaches (US 6,633,759) teaches communication system and mobile communication device, portable information process device, and data communication method used in the same.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANH C LE whose telephone number is 703-306-0542. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WILLIAM TROST can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Danh C.Le



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600